

### REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office Action of October 12, 2007, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-62 are now pending, of which claims 1, 20, 26, 30, 34, 48, 51, and 54 are independent.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiners Taha and Pwu for the personal interview conducted with applicant's representative, Andrew Foy, on February 9, 2008. As reflected by the Interview Summary (see copy of PTOL-413 form attached to this Amendment), applicant's representative and Examiners Taha and Pwu discussed proposed claim amendments and Examiners Taha and Pwu agreed that U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 (Maurille) does not anticipate or render obvious the proposed claim amendments.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 1-35 and 39-53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,196 (Maurille).<sup>1</sup> Claims 36-38 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurille in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,741,990 (Nair).

#### Claims 1-53

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 20, 26, 30, 34, 48, and 51 as discussed during the personal interview conducted on February 9, 2008. As agreed during the personal interview conducted on February 9, 2008, Maurille does not anticipate or render obvious amended independent claims 1, 20, 26, 30, 34, 48, and 51. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-53.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the Office Action suggests that claims 1-20 and 22-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maurille. See Office Action of October 12, 2007 at page 2, lines 9-10. However, the Office Action does not provide grounds of rejection for claims 36-38 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the Office Action also indicates that claims 36-38 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). See Office Action of October 12, 2007 at page 21, lines 9-11. Consequently, applicant understands claims 36-38 and 54 as having been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), not under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### Claim 54

Applicant has amended independent claim 54 as discussed during the personal interview conducted on February 9, 2008. As agreed during the personal interview conducted on February 9, 2008, Maurille does not anticipate or render obvious amended independent claim 54. Furthermore, Nair, which is applied by the Office Action for the sole purpose of teaching a computer program stored on a computer readable medium, does not cure the deficiencies in Maurille with respect to independent claim 54, nor does the Office Action contend that Nair does so. See Office Action of October 12, 2007 at page 22, lines 1-3. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 54.

#### **New Claims**

New dependent claims 55-62 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, applicant submits that new dependent claims 55-62 are allowable at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 1.

#### **Conclusion**

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The fee in the amount of \$520 in payment of the Excess Claims Fee (\$400) and the Petition for One-month Extension of Time (\$120) is being paid concurrently herewith on the


Applicant : John Panzer  
Serial No. : 10/747,677  
Filed : December 30, 2003  
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-  
442001 / Communications 94

Electronic Filing System by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew T. Foy  
Reg. No. 57,333

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331